

REMARKS

Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2 and 5-7 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-8 are currently pending.

Priority

Applicants request the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for priority and safe receipt of the certified priority document filed with the application on January 10, 2002.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Meffert. This rejection is traversed as follows.

Claims 1, 2 and 7 have been amended to overcome the rejection. Antecedent support for the amendments to claims 1, 2 and 7 is found in the specification with reference to Fig. 6, for example, steps 603-607.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that it is first determined whether a query can be processed by accessing one external database, and if so, the query is executed by

accessing the one external database. If the query cannot be processed by access to the one external database, then after ones of the functions in the query specified to be executed in the one external database are executed, the other functions in the query that are not executable in the one external database are executed in an internal database after getting an executed result into the internal database from the one external database.

In claim 2, an access procedure is created for processing execution of some of the functions in the query which cannot be processed in the one external database in an internal database within the database management system if it is determined that said functions referred to in said query are not executable by access to said one external database. In the query execution program set forth in claim 7, an access procedure is also claimed for execution of some of the functions in the query, which cannot be processed in the one external database, in an internal database within the database management system.

In Meffert, a database system for document image and query management is disclosed wherein by linking database

entries and stored document images, the user can query the database to retrieve not only database entries, but also corresponding linked electronic documents. See, col. 3, lines 38-46 of the reference. Accordingly, an image stored in an external database can be displayed by accessing to and calling up the external database if the image is linked with the retrieved data. Meffert does not disclose determining whether a query can be processed completely by access to an external database and if so, executing the query by access to the one external database, and if not, executing ones of the functions that are not executable in the one external database in an internal database, as claimed by applicants. Accordingly, the claims as amended are patentable over Meffert, and therefore the claims should be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks,
Applicants contend that the above-identified application is
now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration
and reexamination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Mattingly", with a stylized flourish at the end.

John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: August 23, 2004